



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

✓

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/754,425	01/04/2001	Flora Kan		1316
7590	09/08/2004		EXAMINER	
Data Unlimited International, Inc. 362A Christopher Ave. Gaithersburg, MD 20879			MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/754,425	KAN ET AL.
	Examiner Susanna M. Diaz	Art Unit 3623 MW

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2001.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/4/01.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

### *Oath/Declaration*

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the mailing address of each inventor. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

The declaration references the wrong application. It references provisional application no. 60/199,552 instead of the instant non-provisional application, application no. 09/754,425.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the any reference signs to correlate them to the description in the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The

replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because Applicant has filed two abstracts. The one filed on January 4, 2001 is objected to because it contains more than 15 lines/150 words and it is longer than one paragraph. Another abstract was filed on April 27, 2001, which is proper; however, Applicant has not identified this abstract as a substitute abstract. Applicant must select one abstract that conforms to the proper abstract format. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

***Information Disclosure Statement***

6. The information disclosure statement filed January 4, 2001 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because it lists a provisional application as a U.S. patent, which is improper. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

7. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Applicant cites the reference "Integration Decision Paper (IDP) for the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)" by Birch & Davis Associates, Inc., May 1, 1996 on page 12 of the provisional application to which Applicant claims priority. Since this reference seems to be very pertinent background to the invention, it is requested

that Applicant submit a copy of this reference, properly citing it as Non-Patent Literature on a form PTO-1449.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-8 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claims are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claims must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent cited.

More specifically, the scope of the claims is unclear. It is not clear if claims 2-8 are dependent from claim 1 or are meant to be independent claims. Dependent claims should reference the claim from which they depend in the preamble of each respective claim. Without understanding the dependency, if any, of each claim, the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be properly assessed.

Claims 1-8 merely recite the ***provision of*** a computer server, a computer client, and various means; however, the term "providing" does not necessarily require that the computer server and computer client perform any functionality. As recited, they merely need to be "able to" perform the listed functionality; therefore, any computer server or

computer client reads on the relevant limitations of the claimed invention. “Providing” a means is as simple as making the means available for potential use and does not necessarily require the active use of the means.

It is not understood if the whereby clauses following claim 8 are part of claim 8, especially since the last two whereby clauses terminate with a period. Each separate claim should only end with one period. Furthermore, the whereby clauses recite functions that “can be” performed; therefore, it is not clear whether or not they are actively carried out. Also, there is no structure associated with the functionality recited in the whereby clauses; therefore, the links between these whereby clauses and the remainder of the claimed invention are lacking. There is no clear nexus between the whereby clauses and the means recited in claims 1-8.

Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

It is unclear whether claims 1-8 are directed toward a method or apparatus.

Claims are limited to one statutory class; therefore, the statutory nature of claims 1-8 is ambiguous.

Appropriate correction is required.

*In light of the numerous rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, the following rejections reflect Examiner's best interpretation of the claimed invention.*

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Sandoval (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,259).

14. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Balaban et al. (US 2003/0028501).

***Remarks***

15. It is called to applicant's attention that if a communication is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service and mailed to the Office by First Class Mail before the reply time has expired, applicant may submit the reply with a "Certificate of Mailing" which merely asserts that the reply is being mailed on a given date. So mailed, before the period for reply has expired, the reply may be considered timely. A suggested format for a certificate follows:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231  
on \_\_\_\_\_ (date).

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

16. An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

Applicant is advised of the availability of the publication "Attorneys and Agents Registered to Practice Before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office." This publication is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

17. Applicant is also instructed to peruse information regarding the patent process on the Patent Office's web site: <http://www.uspto.gov>. In addition to being able to download

the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), the Applicant may also access needed forms as well as useful fee and patent prosecution information.

***Conclusion***

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"Market Source" -- Describes Data Unlimited International, Inc.'s product Starfruit DNA™, a DNA Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS).

19. Applicant is reminded that the shortened statutory period for response to the present Office action on the merits is set at THREE MONTHS (please see MPEP 710.02(b)). If needed, the Applicant may request an extension of time up to, but no more than, SIX MONTHS from the MAILING DATE listed on the cover letter accompanying the Office action. If no proper response is received from the Applicant within six months from this mailing date, the present application will be abandoned. Please read MPEP 710 in its entirety (including MPEP 710.01 through 710.06) to learn more about statutory periods for responses and how to obtain an extension of time, if necessary (e.g., there is a corresponding fee for each month the response time is extended beyond the three-month statutory reply period granted for a response to non-final Office action).

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (703) 305-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

or faxed to:

**(703)305-7687** [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

**(703)746-7048** [Informal/Draft communications, labeled  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

*Susanna Diaz*  
Susanna M. Diaz  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3623  
September 3, 2004